REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are pending. Claims 1-8 are amended for clarity, to assure infringement when the system is sold (prior be put into use), to assure open-ended coverage where appropriate, to modify some temporal aspects, and for proper antecedent basis. Claims 12-16 are added to secure an appropriate scope of protection to which Applicants are deemed entitled.

The rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Inala (U.S. 6,442,590) is hereby traversed. A proper rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102 requires every element of the claim to be included in the reference, either directly or inherently. The Office Action fails to identify all elements of claim 1 that are allegedly anticipated by Inala. There are at least three reasons why the rejection is incorrect.

First, the Office Action erroneously asserts that Inala describes a sessions overview subsystem arranged to receive a notification from the session manager in response to an endpoint system joining or leaving a session. The Office Action equates Inala's server 17 with the session manager; however, no such equivalent for the sessions overview subsystem is identified in the Office Action. As the Office Action fails to identify a sessions overview subsystem in Inala, withdrawal of the rejection is in order.

Second, the Office Action fails to identify any support in Inala for the claimed subject matter wherein the subsystem is arranged to receive notification from the session manager upon an endpoint system joining or leaving a session. The Office Action asserts that the

sessions overview subsystem arranged to receive a notification from the session manager is described in Inala at column 5, lines 45-50; column 8, lines 52-57; and column 9, lines 1-4. Contrary to this assertion, however, Inala's server 17 which, as stated above, has already been equated with the session manager, receives information regarding endpoint systems, e.g., "when a client visits a WEB page (URL) it is reported to server 17" (column 5, lines 49 and 50), "Extension 37 [software executing on the client] monitors the client's browsing activity and sends notification of any new URL invoked to server 17" (column 8, lines 48-50), and "extension 37 notified server 17" (column 9, lines 2 and 3). That is, Inala's server 17 receives notification from the endpoint systems and not from the session manager as in the presently claimed subject matter. The portions of Inala identified in the Office Action fail to support finding a sessions overview subsystem as recited in claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection is in order.

Third, the Office Action asserts that Inala includes a real-time database for "inherently" recording, on the basis of the notifications and for each session that is established, the identity of the associated information page and information about any party whose endpoint system is currently joined to the session. It is respectfully noted that the standard for inherency requires the Examiner to provide a factual basis and/or technical reasoning reasonably supporting the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the prior art teaching. See *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (BPAI 1990). "The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient." *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ3d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (emphasis added). "A claim limitation is inherent in the prior art if it is necessarily present in the prior art, not merely

probably or possibly present." *Rosco v. Mirror Lite*, 304 F.3d 1373, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The Office Action fails to support the inherency assertion regarding the database recording the identity of the associated information page and information about any party whose endpoint system is currently joined to the session based on notifications received upon an endpoint system joining or leaving a session and for each session established.

For any of the foregoing reasons, Inala fails to anticipate all elements of claim 1, and withdrawal of the rejection is in order.

Claims 2-11 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, include further important limitations, and are patentable over Inala for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1. The rejection of claims 2-11 also should be withdrawn.

With specific reference to amended claim 7, Inala fails to disclose a contact center having service representatives with endpoint systems capable of being joined to existing sessions established by the service system. The portions of Inala identified in the Office Action describe establishing a new connection and not the joining of a service representative to an existing session, e.g., "without giving up his or her current page or current status in a chat session" (column 10, lines 64 and 65) and "a client may also leave his or her current chat, and commit to the new chat" (column 11, lines 1-3). Based on the foregoing, Inala fails to anticipate claim 7.

With specific reference to claim 8, the Office Action asserts that Inala discloses creating a service-session entity for joining the endpoint systems to the session by inherently sending connection details of the transport mechanism. At the outset, Applicants refer to the discussion with respect to claim 1 above regarding the standard for inherency.

Further, the Office Action fails to consider all elements of the claim, specifically, that the joining includes sending connection details of the transport mechanism associated with the communication session *to the endpoint system*. Inala fails to disclose the joining involving sending connection details of the transport mechanism to the endpoint system. At column 15, line 52-55, Inala describes the joining as involving "server 17 receives the chat request from a client including client parameters for routing the client into an existing chat session." At the portion of Inala cited in the Office Action, server 17 obtains the IP address from a chat server and fails to disclose sending connection details to the endpoint system. Based on either of the foregoing reasons, Inala fails to anticipate the subject matter of claim 8, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

With specific reference to claim 10, the Office Action asserts that Inala discloses a transport mechanism associated with a communication session inherently providing multiple data transfer channels, for different media types, between endpoint systems joined to the communication session. At the outset, Applicants again refer to the discussion with respect to claim 1 above regarding the standard for inherency.

Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, column 16, lines 1-10, of Inala fails to disclose a transport mechanism providing multiple data transfer channels between endpoint systems. Column 16, lines 1-10, says the server 17 (1) obtains an IP address from a chat server having a matching URL and (2) uses meta-tags to route to and establish connection with an appropriate session. However, there is no disclosure of a transport mechanism providing multiple data transfer channels between endpoint systems. Based on either of the foregoing reasons, Inala fails to anticipate the subject matter of claim 10.

Claim 12 recites a method of generating a view of current page sessions and information about the parties associated with the page sessions. The method includes the steps of establishing, by a session manager of a service system, a session between an endpoint system and an information page served by an information page server and joining or removing, by the session manager, an endpoint system of a party currently located on an information page to a corresponding communication session for the information page established by the session manager. The method further includes the steps of notifying, by the session manager, a sessions overview subsystem in response to an endpoint system joining or being removed from a session and recording, to a database in the sessions overview subsystem, the identity of the associated information page and information about a party whose endpoint system is currently joined to a session based on receipt of a notification from the session manager and for each session established by the session manager.

Claim 14 recites a method of joining a customer service representative to an existing page session. The method includes the step of returning a session-overview web page to a customer service representative responsive to receiving a request from a customer service representative. The session-overview web page includes a list of: one or more page sessions, a session identifier for each of the one or more page sessions, and information associated with the party whose endpoint system is joined to the session,

session, wherein the one or more page sessions are sessions established between an endpoint system and an information page. The method further includes the step of joining the customer service representative to a particular session responsive to receipt of the session identifier from the customer service representative.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary during prosecution, Applicants hereby request any required extension of time not otherwise requested and hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge any prescribed fees not otherwise provided for, including application processing, extension of time, and extra claims fees, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,
Colin Andrew LOW et al.

By: _____
Randy A. Noranbrock
Reg. No. 42,940

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
703-684-1111 telephone
970-898-0640 telecopier
AML:RAN:alw:rk

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: (Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450)

On April 13, 2005

Roseanna Keple